

Message Text

PAGE 01 NATO 06646 01 OF 02 292227Z

64

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 /085 W

----- 033568

P R 291700Z NOV 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9064

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDELM MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 1 OF 2 USNATO 6646

E.O. 11652: GDS

TAGS: PARM, NATO

SUBJECT: MBFR: NOVEMBER 27 DATA SUPPORT SUBGROUP MEETING

REF: A. STATE 261539 (NOTAL)

B. USNATO 6513 (NOTAL)

BEGIN SUMMARY: ON NOVEMBER 27 MBFR DATA SUPPORT SUBGROUP (SGDS) ADDRESSED COMPARISON TABLES ON NATO AND WP GROUND AND AIR FORCES IN THE NGA (AC/276(SGDS)- N/29). US REP PRESENTED US VIEWS ON INADEQUACY OF N/29 AND NEED FOR REVISED AND EXPANDED VERSION DESCRIBED REF A. NO SGDS NATIONAL REPS SUPPORTED US VIEW ON NECESSITY TO PRODUCE A MATCHING NATO COMPANION DOCUMENT TO MCM ON PACT FORCES; FRG, IN PARTICULAR, OPPOSED INCLUDING DETAILS ON NATO AIR FORCES. MOST REPS FAVORED A SIMPLER, LESS DETAILED DATA PACKAGE LIKE AC/276(SGDS)-N/29. US REP IN LIGHT OF OPPOSITION TO US VIEW, AGREED TO ASK HIS AUTHORITIES FOR FURTHER GUIDANCE INCLUDING POSSIBLE ALTERNATIVE OR COMPROMISE APPROACH. ACTION REQUESTED: EARLY IN WEEK OF DECEMBER 2, RECOMMENDATIONS FOR NEXT STEPS REGARDING
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06646 01 OF 02 292227Z

STAFF GROUP WORK ON COMPARISON TABLES. END SUMMARY.

1. DISCUSSION AT NOVEMBER 27 MBFR DATA SUPPORT SUBGROUP (SGDS) CENTERED ON QUESTION OF COMPARISON TABLES ON NATO AND

WP GROUND AND AIR FORCES IN THE NGA. CHAIRMAN REFERRED TO STAFF GROUP DEVELOPED NATO AND WP COMPARISON TABLES (AC/276(SGDS)-N/29), WHICH HE BELIEVED MET THE US REQUEST, BEARING IN MIND SCOPE OF AD HOC GROUP'S (AHG) DATA REQUESTS. CHAIRMAN NOTED THAT USDEL MC HAD JUST ASKED IMS TO REMOVE MC224 FROM NOVEMBER 28 MC AGENDA, THUS MC 224/74 PACT DATA IS NOT YET NATO AGREED. HE UNDERLINED THAT SCOPE OF DATA IN EMERGING SPECIAL MCM ON PACT FORCES IN NGA WENT BEYOND SCOPE OF N/29 AND STAFF GROUP'S UNDERSTANDING OF AHG DATA REQUESTS. HE EMPHASIZED WORK ON N/29 HAD PROVED TIME-CONSUMING AND ADDED THAT IF COMPARISON TABLES INCLUDED ALL NATO AIR FORCE UNITS AND THEIR DEPLOYMENT, TABLES MOST LIKELY WOULD REQUIRE CTS CLASSIFICATION. US REP EXPRESSED APPRECIATION FOR STAFF GROUP'S PRELIMINARY EFFORT AND SAID HE DID NOT BELIEVE A CTS CLASSIFICATION WOULD CAUSE HIS AUTHORITIES CONCERN. DRAWING ON REF A, US REP SAID THAT IN WASHINGTON'S VIEW N/29 DOES NOT FULFIL THE REQUIREMENTS FOR A DOCUMENT ON NATO FORCES IN THE NGA MATCHING IN FORMAT AND LEVEL OF DETAIL THE EMERGING MCM ON PACT FORCES, POINTED OUT REASONS US BELIEVED SUCH A DOCUMENT IS ESSENTIAL, RECOMMENDED USING ANNEX B OF N/29 AS A STARTING FRAMEWORK, NOTED NEED FOR DATA COMPARABILITY (TIME-WISE) AND URGED SGDS TO TURN ITS FULL ATTENTION TO PRODUCING A TRUE NATO COMPANION VOLUME BY JANUARY 1975.

2. CHAIRMAN SAID STAFF GROUP HAD INTERPRETED US REQUEST TO MEAN NOT 100 PERCENT COMPARABLE; HE UNDERLINED THAT IT WOULD TAKE STAFF GROUP SEVERAL MONTHS TO PRODUCE DOCUMENT AS DETAILED AS THE MCM AND THIS EFFORT WOULD DUPLICATE MUCH OF NATO NGA PORTION OF PUBLISHED BLUE BOOK ON NATO AND WP FORCES; IN ESSENCE SUCH AN APPROACH WOULD DO AWAY WITH THE NEED FOR THE NGA PORTION OF THE BLUE BOOK.

3. ALL COUNTRIES REPRESENTED (BELGIUM, CANADA, FRG, NETHERLANDS, AND UK) FOUND STAFF GROUP APPROACH (N/29) SATISFACTORY. NETHERLANDS REP (LTC VAN DER GRAAF) EMPHASIZED THAT NETHERLANDS VIENNA DELEGATION FINDS N/29 ADEQUATE. FRG REP (COL. DZIALAS) SAID SINCE THERE IS NO NATO AGREEMENT TO REDUCE AIR FORCES, IT WOULD BE MOST MISLEADING TO SHOW IN COMPARISON TABLES DETAILS ON MANPOWER OF
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06646 01 OF 02 292227Z

NATO AIR FORCE UNITS ASSOCIATED WITH AIRCRAFT. FRG REP ADDED N/29 USEFULLY PROVIDED EASY, QUICK DATA REFERENCE AND BLUE BOOK CONTAINS DETAILS. BELGIAN (MAJ. SOUPART), FRG, AND NETHERLANDS REPS ALL INDICATED THAT US APPROACH WOULD PROVIDE MORE DETAILS THEN THEY BELIEVED MBFR NEGOTIATORS CURRENTLY NEED; THEY FAVORED IN ONE FORM OR ANOTHER A MORE "SUMMARIZED" APPROACH THAT WOULD NOT REQUIRE FURTHER LENGTHY PREPARATION TIME. UK REP (LTC BLANCHARD), SUPPORTED BY BELGIUM, POINTED OUT INCLUSION OF NATO AIR UNITS IN DETAIL MEANS THAT NATO WOULD HAVE TO AGREE ON A MORE PRECISE DEFINITION OF NATO AIR AND GROUND MANPOWER. CHAIRMAN ADDED IT IS DIFFICULT TO BREAKOUT AIR ELEMENTS OF NATO COUNTRIES IN NEAT COMPARABLE COMPONENTS AS COUNTRIES HAVE DIFFERENT FORCE STRUCTURES.

4. CHAIRMAN, NOTING ALL COUNTRIES WITH FORCES IN NGA ARE REPRESENTED ON SGDS (SAVE LUXEMBOURG), PROPOSED AS EXPEDITED MEANS OF OVERCOMING SGDS IMPASSE, TO ELEVATE PROBLEM BY SENDING A NATO-WIDE MESSAGE SOLICITING COUNTRIES (MOD'S) INSTRUCTED VIEWS ON N/29 AND US-SUGGESTED APPROACHES. US REP SAID HE DID NOT BELIEVE IT WAS SUCH A CLEAR-CUT "EITHER-OR" QUESTION, AND THAT HE WOULD ASK HIS AUTHORITIES FOR FURTHER GUIDANCE, INCLUDING SUGGESTIONS FOR ALTERNATIVE OR COMPROMISE APPROACH. IN CONCLUDING DISCUSSION OF COMPARISON TABLES, CHAIRMAN UNDERLINED TIMEELEMENT BY INDICATING IT WOULD TAKE SEVERAL MONTHS TO PRODUCE TABLES ALONG LINE OF US REQUEST AND NOTED MOST COUNTRIES WERE PREPARED TO ACCEPT N/29. COMMENT: LACK OF ALLIED SUPPORT FOR US APPROACH ON THIS DATA QUESTION APPEARS INFLUENCED BY THEIR VIEWS OF WHEN AHG NEEDS DATA AND AT WHAT LEVEL OF DETAIL.

END COMMENT.

SECRET

PAGE 01 NATO 06646 02 OF 02 300007Z

64

ACTION ACDA-10

INFO OCT-01 EUR-12 ISO-00 AEC-05 CIAE-00 H-01 INR-05 IO-10

L-02 NSAE-00 OIC-02 OMB-01 PA-01 PM-03 PRS-01 SAJ-01

SAM-01 SP-02 SS-15 USIA-06 TRSE-00 RSC-01 NSC-05 /085 W

----- 034669

P R 291700Z NOV 74

FM USMISSION NATO

TO SECSTATE WASHDC PRIORITY 9065

SECDEF WASHDC PRIORITY

INFO AMEMBASSY BONN

AMEMBASSY THE HAGUE

AMEMBASSY LONDON

USDEL MBFR VIENNA

USNMR SHAPE

S E C R E T SECTION 2 OF 2 USNATO 6646

5. FOLLOWING MEETING, CHAIRMAN REQUESTED FURTHER WASHINGTON VIEWS EARLY IN WEEK OF DECEMBER 2 SO HE CAN IN HIS WORDS "GET IN" WITH THE COMPARISON TABLES. HE ADDED THAT BEFORE CIRCULATING A NOTE ON NOVEMBER 27 MEETING, HE WOULD APPRECIATE WASHINGTON'S FURTHER VIEWS IN LIGHT OF SUBGROUP'S REACTION TO US SUGGESTED APPROACH. IN SAME PRIVATE CONVERSATION, CHAIRMAN CLAIMED SPECIAL MCM ON PACT FORCES THAT IS EMERGING FROM MC 224 CONFERENCE CONTAINS CONSIDERABLY MORE DETAIL THAN FORMAT CHAIRMAN ENVISAGED, DURING DISCUSSION WITH VISITING WASHINGTON DATA EXPERT (LTC KELIHER), PRIOR TO MC 224 CONFERENCE.

6. REGARDING SECOND SGDS AGENDA ITEM: BLUE BOOK ON NATO AND WP

FORCES, CHAIRMAN ANNOUNCED HIS INTENTION TO PUBLISH A REVISED BLUE BOOK BEFORE THE END OF 1974, PROVIDED NEW FIGURES IN MC 224/74 QUICKLY BECOME NATO AGREED. IN RESPONSE TO QUESTION FROM US REP, CHAIRMAN SAID NATO DATA WAS FOR END-1973 AND WP FOR MID-1974. US REP REGRETTED TIME GAP; IN LENGTHY RESPONSE CHAIRMAN OUTLINED DATA COLLECTION AND DATA VERIFICATION PROBLEMS.

7. ON THIRD AGENDA ITEM: "REFERENCE LIST OF MBFR TERMS AND
SECRET

PAGE 02 NATO 06646 02 OF 02 300007Z

DEFINITIONS USED BY SGDS", AC/276(SGDS)-N/18(3RD REVISE),
SUBGROUP ACCEPTED A NUMBER OF INTERNATIONAL STAFF, FRG, AND

NETHERLANDS PROPOSED AMENDMENTS. CHAIRMAN WILL CIRCULATE A
CORRIGENDUM. US REP HELD OPEN DOOR FOR POSSIBLE WASHINGTON
COMMENTS.

MISSION COMMENT: MISSION MAILED N/18 (3RD REVISE) TO DOD MBFR TASK
FORCE, UNDER APO REG NUMBER 4675 ON NOVEMBER 4; MISSION HAS
RECEIVED A RECEIPT FROM PENTAGON CENTRAL REGISTRY DATED NOVEMBER
11. END COMMENT.

8. REGARDING FOURTH AGENDA ITEM: "NEED FOR UPDATING NATO FORCES
BI-ANNUALLY", AC/276(SGDS)-N/28, CHAIRMAN NOTED IT TAKES OVER 9
MONTHS TO PRODUCE THE DATA IN THE BLUE BOOK AND HENCE A SEMI-ANNUAL
BLUE BOOK UPDATE WAS NOT POSSIBLE; HE ADDED MAYBE A
"MINI-UPDATE" WAS POSSIBLE. US REP IN OUTLINING LATEST
WASHINGTON VIEWS IN REF A, STRESSED THAT WE FAVORED AN UPDATING
OF SPECIFIC BUT NOT ALL DATA ON A SEMI-ANNUAL BASIS AND THAT A
TWICE YEARLY SUBMISSION TO THE NATO FORCE PLANNING DATA BASE
WAS OUT OF THE QUESTION. FRG REP, ON INSTRUCTIONS, WAS
CATEGORICALLY OPPOSED TO A SEMI-ANNUAL UPDATE. HE SAID FRG
OPPOSED A SEMI-ANNUAL UPDATE SINCE FORCE LEVELS OF COUNTRIES
LIKE HIS WHO UTILIZE CONSCRIPTION CHANGE ABRUPTLY. HE NOTED
THE TIME FACTOR DESCRIBED IN N/28 AND THAT DIFFICULTIES APPLIED
BOTH TO NATO AND PACT FIGURES. HE SAID FRG PROVIDES FIGURES WHICH
EQUATE TO THE AVERAGE NUMBER OF PERSONNEL ON ACTIVE DUTY OVER A
GIVEN PERIOD OF TIME. HE ADDED THESE FIGURES MUST COINCIDE WITH
FIGURES IN THE ANNUAL FRG DEFENSE WHITE PAPER. HENCE, FRG IS
OPPOSED ON POLITICAL AND TECHNICAL GROUNDS TO A SEMI-ANNUAL
UPDATE, WHICH WOULD NOT SERVE THE BEST INTERESTS OF MBFR.

MISSION COMMENT: FRG REP IMPLIED THAT AS FRG HAS A POLITICALLY SET
FIGURE FOR FRG DATE IN MBFR THAT THERE IS NO PURPOSE IN
ENTERING TIME CONSUMING EXERCISE OF UPDATING DATA SEMI-ANNUALLY.
END COMMENT.

9. BELGIAN AND NETHERLANDS REPS FOUND FRG ARGUMENTS CONVINCING
AND BELGIAN REP STRESSED THAT IT IS DANGEROUS TO MODIFY THE
DATA NEGOTIATING BASE TOO OFTEN. CHAIRMAN RECALLED HIS
EXPERIENCES AND PROBLEMS WHEN NATO FIGURES DO NOT ADD UP TO
SECRET

PAGE 03 NATO 06646 02 OF 02 300007Z

THEIR "PREDESTINED" TOTALS.

10. UNDER ANY OTHER BUSINESS, CHAIRMAN REFERRED TO CORRESPONDENCE
(SEE USNATO 5989) FROM US REP ON "STRENGTH OF SOVIET ARMED
FORCES (800 THOUSAND). US REP DREW HIS COLLEAGUES' ATTENTION
TO LATEST DIA IMPUT ON 800 THOUSAND, WHICH WAS CIRCULATED BY
NATO SITUATION CENTER (AS(74(162) AND UNDERLINED PRELIMINARY
NATURE OF DIA ESTIMATE AND THT THE DIA ESTIMATE IS NOT REPEAT
NOT AN AGREED US GOVERNMENT POSITION.
MCAULIFFE

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: X
Capture Date: 11 JUN 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: n/a
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 29 NOV 1974
Decaption Date: 01 JAN 1960
Decaption Note:
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: golinofr
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1974ATO06646
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: n/a
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 GDS
Errors: n/a
Film Number: n/a
From: NATO
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1974/newtext/t19741185/abbryyuc.tel
Line Count: 231
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE
Office: n/a
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: n/a
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 5
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Reference: A. STATE 261539 (NOTAL) B. USNATO 6513 (NOTAL)
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: golinofr
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 27 MAR 2002
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <27 MAR 2002 by kelleyw0>; APPROVED <28 MAY 2002 by golinofr>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: MBFR: NOVEMBER 27 DATA SUPPORT SUBGROUP MEETING
TAGS: PARM, NATO
To: STATE
SECDEF INFO BONN
THE HAGUE
LONDON
MBFR VIENNA
USNMR SHAPE
Type: TE

Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005